

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 7, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being unpatentable over D'Amato et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,511,083). Claims 4-6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Amato et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,511,083) in view of Putnam et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,594,288).

By this Amendment, Applicants are amending claims 1 and 10. These amendments are simply for clarification, and do not foreclose application of reasonable equivalents.

**Preliminary Remarks**

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering and initialing the references filed with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on February 20, 2004.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner acknowledge Applicants' claim to foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, as well as receipt of the priority document filed on February 20, 2004. Applicants further respectfully request acceptance of the drawings filed February 20, 2004.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)**

*Claims 1-3, 7, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being unpatentable over D'Amato et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,511,083).* Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 recites, in part, "a first cavity in which lasing occurs at a first frequency, and at least one second cavity in which lasing occurs at a second frequency..." The Examiner argues that D'Amato discloses a laser having a first and at least one second cavity in which lasing occurs at a first frequency and a second frequency, respectively, citing D'Amato FIG. 1,

elements 24 and 50, and 36 and 44 as support for this argument. However, in D'Amato, 24 and 36 are the same wavelength ( $\lambda_L$ ), and are thus at the same frequency. Additionally, D'Amato does not teach that the fiber laser source has a first and second cavity in which lasing occurs at a first frequency and a second frequency, respectively. Instead, D'Amato teaches "a laser cavity" 18. See col. 3, lines 45-49, and col. 6, lines 44-46.

Further, claim 1 of the present invention recites a first wave having a first power and a second wave having a second power inside the respective first and at least one second cavities. D'Amato discloses only one lasing wavelength, and makes no mention of whether a first and second wave have a first and second power, respectively. The Examiner argues that D'Amato, FIG. 1, elements 24 and 50, 36 and 44, and col. 2, lines 40-50 disclose a first and second wave, having a first and second power. Instead, D'Amato actually teaches a first and second polarization of a wave with each polarization having the same wavelength. Because polarization does not disclose the power of a wave, D'Amato fails to teach this aspect of the claimed invention.

D'Amato fails to teach all of the elements of claim 1, and therefore, claim 1 is patentable over the applied art.

Claims 2, 3, 7, 8 and 10 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

*Claims 4-6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Amato et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,511,083) in view of Putnam et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,594,288). Applicants respectfully traverse.*

Claims 4-6 and 9 are dependent from claim 1. Because D'Amato fails to disclose all of the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and because Putnam fails to cure the deficiencies noted in D'Amato with respect to claim 1, either individually or in combination, claims 4-6 and 9 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860


WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 17, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

  
Jeffrey A. Schmidt  
Registration No. 41,574